

Remarks and Arguments

Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80 and 95-110 are pending in this application. Claims 24-29, 31, 36-43, 62-64, 78, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 107, 109 and 110 have been amended. New claims 111 and 112 have been added.

Claims 24-43, 62-64, 78-80, and 95-110 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5, 872, 915, already of record, hereafter referred to as Dykes. In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner has cited the same sections of Dykes specified in the prior office action which are alleged to disclose the limitation of claims 24, 62 and 78, as well as their respective dependent claims. In setting forth the rejection the Examiner has stated:

"In the Office action mailed on February 20, 2002, page 3, the Examiner states that the limitation of "disallowing certain user functions" is inherently disclosed by Dykes since a NETSCAPE is capable of presenting content or object within a browser window of the Web browser, and therefore, capable of disabling a disallowed user function (Dykes, abstract, lines 1-10, col.3, lines 22-58, col. 4, lines 47-57)."

The present invention concerns a security system that allows a user to download content from a source, such as a publisher, to his or her web browser. The security system secures the content at the source and only permits it to be downloaded to a client computer running a limited-user browser or a general-purpose browser executing an add-in security module providing the same functions as a limited-user browser. The browser secures the downloaded content on the client computer and displays it in a "view-only" mode. This system permits a source to download content for previewing by a user without fully releasing the content for general use because the source controls what functions can be performed by the browser. In addition, the system requires no special passwords or other user authentication.

The mechanism by which the browser is disabled varies in accordance with different embodiments of the invention. In one embodiment, the plug-in module that converts a standard browser to a limited use browser is downloaded from a source or publisher (see page 16, lines 24-27 of the present specification.) In another embodiment, information that controls how content is viewed arrives at the user's

browser in a secure document that also contains the content (see page 19, lines 21-26 and page 21, lines 16-26.)

The restrictions on the browser also depend on the particular embodiment. In one embodiment, all forms of non-ephemeral reproduction (e.g. printing, saving to disk, etc.) are disabled. While the secured content is being displayed, menu selections, key combination, or pointing device commands initiated on the client computer that would modify the content or create a copy on another medium are either disabled by default or monitored to determine if the action is permitted. The protected content can be displayed in a window within the browser frame or in a separate window having a special control set.

None of the references cited by the examiner permit a source to configure a browser running in a user computer to prevent unauthorized reproduction of displayed content. For example, the Dykes reference discloses a system for providing secure access to a software application. In the disclosed system, a user provides a password or other authenticating information to a gateway. The gateway uses the authentication information to determine whether the user has access to the software application and to set up a secure channel between the software application and the user's browser. Control is provided by sending protected information only to authenticated browsers. No security information is returned to the browser which disables or modifies any browser functions.

Similarly, the Wallent reference cited by the examiner permits a source to configure a browser running in a user computer to prevent unauthorized reproduction of displayed content. In the Wallent reference, the user sets up security zones or sites in the browser and determines what browser functions will be allowed in each site. Then the user adds web addresses to each site. When content is received in the browser, the web address where the content originated is checked and used to determine to which zone the site belongs. The browser is then configured in accordance with the functions chosen by the user for this site.

Applicants have amended the claims to distinctly claim these differences. For example, claims 24-29, 40 and 62 have been amended as set forth in claim 24 which represents these changes. Claim 24 now recites, in lines 5-6 and 10-12, "downloading

from the source to the web browser authorization information that configures the web browser to process content in a manner determined by the source... and ...as determined by the source in accordance with the authorization information, disabling at the local computer system a disallowed user function that affects the downloaded content when the downloaded content is within the browser window.” Thus, claim 24 recites information downloaded from the content source that allows the source to determine how the web browser will process content. As discussed above, neither the Dykes nor Wallent references disclose such a method step. Claims 25-29, 40 and 62 recite similar limitations to claim 24.

Claims 30-39 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on amended claim 24 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they also distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 24. Some of these dependent claims have been amended to conform them to the changes made in claim 24.

Claims 40-43 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on amended claim 40 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they also distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 40. These dependent claims have been amended to conform them to the changes made in claim 40.

Claims 63 and 64 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on amended claim 62 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they also distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 62. These dependent claims have been amended to conform them to the changes made in claim 62.

Amended claim 78 recites, in lines 3-8, “...means for receiving from the source, authorization information that configures a web browser executing in the client computer system to process content in a manner determined by the source and means responsive to the authorization information for modifying the web browser to prevent the web browser from being used to reproduce, in at least one form, content received by the web browser...” Thus, claim 78 also recites information downloaded from the content source that allows the source to determine how the web browser will process content. As discussed above, neither the Dykes nor Wallent references disclose such elements. Consequently, amended claim 78 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference.

Amended claims 95, 98, and 101 also recite similar limitations. For example, claim 95, which is representative of this claim group, recites, in lines 3-8, the steps of...downloading a viewer program from the source, receiving from the source function authorization data indicating which of the viewer functions may be performed at the local computer system on the content and disabling at the local computer system selected viewer functions in accordance with the function authorization data received from the source. Thus, claim 95 recites information downloaded from the content source that allows the source to determine how the web browser will process content. This information includes a viewer and function authorization information that determines which functions will be enabled in the viewer. As discussed above, neither the Dykes nor Wallent references disclose such elements. Consequently, amended claim 95 patentably distinguishes over the cited references. amend claims 98 and 101 contain similar wording.

Claims 96 and 97, 99-100 and 102-103 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on amended claims 95, 98 and 101, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they also distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claims 95, 98 and 101. Some of these dependent claims have been amended to conform them to the changes made in their respective parent claims.

Amended claims 104, 107 and 109 also include limitations similar to the prior independent claims. Specifically, claim 104, which is representative of the group, recites, in lines 5-7 and 10-11 "...receiving a document containing function authorization data and content from the source, the function authorization data specifying which presentation program functions are enabled and disabled" and "selectively enabling at the local computer system presentation program functions in accordance with the function authorization data received from the source. As stated above, neither the Dykes nor Wallent references disclose such method steps. Claims 107 and 109 recite similar limitations to claim 104.

Claims 105-106, 108 and 110 are dependent, either directly or indirectly on amended claims 104, 107 and 109, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they also distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claims

104, 107 and 109. Some of these dependent claims have been amended to conform them to the changes made in their respective parent claims.

New claims 111 and 112 have been added to more carefully define the invention. Both of these claims are dependent on amended claim 24. Claim 111 specifies that the plug-in information is downloaded before that content is downloaded. Claim 112 specifies that the authorization information is part of a document that includes the content. These claims are supported by portions of the specification as set forth on the bottom of page 14 and the top of page 15 of this amendment.

The amendments to the claims set forth herein have been offered to advance this application to issue. None of the amendments made herein should be construed as an admission that the subject matter of the claims, as originally filed, is anticipated by or made obvious in light of any art of record whether considered singularly or in combinations. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims in another co-pending application without being prejudiced by any amendments, including cancellation of claims, made herein.

Applicant believes the claims are in allowable condition. A notice of allowance for this application is solicited earnestly. If the Examiner has any further questions regarding this amendment, he/she is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any balances under 37 CFR §§1.17 and 1.16 to Deposit Account No. 02-3038.

Respectfully submitted



Date: 12/12/03

Paul E. Kudirka, Esq. Reg. No. 26, 931
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
Customer Number 021127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656